

A

0
0
0
6
4
8
5
0
2
7



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
RIVERSIDE

2.75
ID# 2247409

Series II, No. 1.

ADVERSARIA SINICA

BY

^{11en}
HERBERT A. GILES

¹¹¹
M.A., LL.D. (Aberd.)

PROFESSOR OF CHINESE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

With Illustrations

SHANGHAI
Messrs. KELLY & WALSH Ltd.
1915

PL 1027

G6

v. 2

POE'S "RAVEN"—IN CHINESE

Chia I, born in the year 200 B.C., rose when no more than a boy to high office. Like many other notable Chinese statesmen, he suffered banishment, and died from chagrin at the early age of thirty-three. He wrote a great deal of poetry, and among his works is a piece entitled "The Owl," the opening words of which are extraordinarily suggestive of Poe's famous poem. It is to the credit of Dr. W. A. P. Martin that the similarity was first pointed out by him (*North American Review* for 1901, p. 857); but with this discovery I am constrained to say that Dr. Martin's credit begins and ends. For his attempt at translation cannot be regarded as a serious contribution. It is not even a liberal paraphrase, with a few ancillary touches of the paraphrast to help out the sense, or the metre. Whole sentences of several lines, not to be found in the Chinese original, are freely inserted, and a ring of Poe's craftsmanship, faintly heard, except in a few of the opening lines, is imparted to the translation, to a quite unjustifiable extent. Thus, Dr. Martin begins his version with—

 Betwixt moss-covered reeking walls,

 An exiled poet lay—

 On his bed of straw reclining,

 Half despairing, half repining—

not a single word of which is discoverable in Chia I's poem.

In 1912, Dr. Martin published the second edition of a little volume entitled "Chinese Legends and Lyrics," in the preface to which he says, "My harp, long silent, was suddenly awakened on June 21, 1905,

by thoughts of home." Here we find our poem re-appearing in a somewhat new dress. In order, no doubt, to enhance the analogy with Poe's "Raven," the Chinese poem is now made to begin with these most inappropriate words, in which the season of the year is quite arbitrarily changed,—

'Twas in the month of chill November,
As I can very well remember—
In dismal, gloomy, crumbling halls.

Then come the four lines quoted above, and the poem continues:—

When athwart the window sill
Flew in a bird of omen ill,
And seemed inclined to stay.

To my book of occult learning,
Suddenly I thought of turning,
All the mystery to know,
Of that shameless owl or crow,
That would not go away.

"Wherever such a bird shall enter,
'Tis sure some power above has sent her
(So said the mystic book) to show
The human dweller forth must go,"—
But *where* it did not say.

Then anxiously the bird addressing,
And my ignorance confessing,
"Gentle bird, in mercy deign
The will of Fate to me explain,—
Where *is* my future way?"

It raised its head as if 'twere seeking
To answer me by simply speaking,
Then folded up its sable wing,
Nor did it utter anything,
But breathed a "Well-a-day!"

More eloquent than any diction,
That simple sigh produced conviction,
Furnishing to me the key
Of the awful mystery
That on my spirit lay.

"Fortune's wheel is ever turning,
To human eye there's no discerning
Weal or woe in any state;
Wisdom is to bide your fate;"—
This is what it seemed to say
By that simple "Well-a-day."

With this second "Well-a-day," which is quite a harmless gloss of the translator's, Dr. Martin brings the poem to an abrupt end in less than forty lines, although, as will be seen, it is a very much longer affair.

Apart from the coincidence of a bird and a disconsolate man, there is very little in the one poem which is common to the other. Poe bade his raven give a categorical answer to the question of reunion in the life to come:—

Prophet! said I, thing of evil!
Prophet still, if bird or devil!
By that heaven that bends above us
By that God we both adore,
Tell this soul, with sorrow laden,

If within the distant Aiden,
 It shall clasp a sainted maiden,
 Whom the angels name Lenore—
 Clasp a rare and radiant maiden,
 Whom the angels name Lenore?
 Quoth the Raven: Never more.

Chia I begged the owl to give him some indication as to the future course of his own life in this world; and when the bird did no more than heave a sigh, he himself launched out into a rambling discourse, evidently based upon the sayings of Lao Tzū and of Chuang Tzū, the earliest Taoist philosopher, and containing several allusions to the God of ancient China, whose personality is so vividly set forth in the older books of the Confucian Canon, and which at the date of this poem had by no means faded out.

The main object of the following translation is to show how far there is any real analogy between Chia I's "Owl" and Poe's "Raven." Only a certain measure of success can be claimed. There occur in the former poem some very difficult lines; these may perhaps be improved upon by some enthusiast who has either had the wit to see their meaning himself, or has some friendly native scholar at hand from whom he can obtain the desired light.

*Prefatory Remarks*¹

Chia I had been tutor to the prince of Ch'ang-sha for three years, when a *fu* bird flew into his house, and alighted on the corner of the divan. A *fu* resembles an owl, and is a bird of ill omen.²

Chia I, who had been exiled, was then living at Ch'ang-sha (in Hunan), a low-lying, damp place; and grieving over the thought that his life would not be a long one, he composed this poem, elaborating the theme himself, as speaker.

The Fu Bird

In the *shan o* year (B.C. 174),³
In the early summer of the fourth moon,
On the day *kéng tzü*, as the sun was declining,
A *fu* bird settled on my house.
It came on to the corner of the divan,
With a leisurely air—
A strange visitor indeed;⁴
I wondered why it appeared.⁵
So I opened my divining-books,⁶
And read these prophetic words:—
When a wild bird flies into a house,
The master will soon go out.
Then I said to the *fu*,
If I go, whither will it be?
If the answer is favourable, say so;
If unfavourable, tell me the worst;
As to sooner or later,
Tell me the date.
The *fu* heaved a sigh,
Raised its head and flapped its wings;
And as it could not speak,
I begged it to indicate its feelings.⁷
I said, "The myriad permutations of nature
Go steadily on without cease;
There is an everlasting flow
Either pushing forward or coming back;
Form is always being restored to vitality,
The old slough exchanged for the new skin.
Profound is this endless process;

How can words adequate be found?
Misfortune is the foundation of good fortune;
In good fortune misfortune lies hid.⁸
Sorrow and joy gather in the same family;
Weal and woe abide in the same district.
The Wu State was very powerful,
But Fu Ch'a (5th cent. B. C.) brought it to ruin;
The king of Yüeh took refuge at Kuei-chi,
Yet Kou Chien obtained the hegemony;
Li Ssü migrated and achieved success,
But finally he suffered the five punishments.
Fu Yüeh (14th cent. B. C.) had been convicted,
Yet he became Minister to the Emperor Wu Ting.
Misfortune and good fortune,
Are they not like rope-strands linked together?
The will of God cannot be stated,
For who knows whither it reaches?
If water is flung out, it dries up;
If an arrow is flung out, it travels afar.
All things are subject to these divergences,
And are forced to fulfil their revolutions.
Clouds gather and rain falls,
Coming down in all directions;
Nature scatters things around,
Ubiquitously, without limit.
God's ways cannot be forecast,
Nor can His eternal truths be provided against.
Whether sooner or later depends on His will;
How can we know exactly when?
Consider: the universe is the melting-pot,
And Nature is the artificer;

The *Yin* and the *Yang* are the charcoal,
And all creation is the metal.
For the union (birth) or the dispersal (death) of the breath
How can there be any fixed rule?
There were thousands and myriads of permutations
Before the existence of the Absolute (God).
Suddenly, you become a man;
Why strike the lyre (rejoice)?
You change to an uncanny thing;
Why should that make you sorrow?
Narrow wisdom is all for self;
Others are worthless, I am of worth.
The really wise man takes a broad view;
There is nothing without its value.
The sordid seek wealth;
Heroes seek fame;
The highly-placed die for power;
The masses think only of life.
He who is tempted by gain
Hurries east and then west;
The truly great man never changes,
But keeps a uniformity of purpose.
The fool is bound by conventionalities,
And is helpless, as though in gaol;
The perfect man disregards the things of this world,
And occupies himself with eternal truth.
The masses are greatly led astray,
Filling their lives with loves and hates.
The pure man is happy in a desert,
Alone, in peace, with eternal truth.
Discard wisdom, disregard form,

And contentedly accept annihilation of self;
 All space thus suddenly becomes a great void
 Through which you roam with eternal truth.
 If the tide favours, sail on;
 When you meet danger, then stop.
 Release the body, and yield to the will of God;
 Do not act only in reference to self.
 This life is like floating about at random;
 Death is like stoppage;
 Unruffled as the calm of a deep abyss,
 Moving like a boat adrift.
 Therefore do not regard life as your treasure,
 But cultivate the path of vacuity.
 The man of virtue will have no entanglements,
 And recognizing the will of God, he will not grieve.
 These matters are trifles, like grass;
 Why worry about them?

Coincidences, such as may be traced in the opening lines of the above, may frequently be discovered by the student of Chinese literature. Readers of French poetry will remember the beautiful "Consolation" which Malherbe addressed, (*circa* 1600) to his friend du Périer when the latter lost a much loved daughter, named Marguerite. One verse runs thus:

Mais elle était du monde, où les plus belles choses
 Ont le pire destin;
 Et rose elle a vécu ce que vivent les roses,
 L'espace d'un matin.

In China, early in the 9th century, a famous poet, Po Chü-i, addressed a similar consolation to a father and mother who had also lost a much loved daughter, only a few months before she

was to have been married. Her name was 簡簡, the nearest equivalent of which would be something like Allegra. The Chinese poet, just as his later-born colleague, mentions the "appas" of which "son enfance était pleine," and ends with the following six lines, which I have tried to render as literally as possible:

彩	大	只	恐	此	丈
雲	都	合	是	女	人
易	好	人	天	不	阿
散	物	間	仙	是	母
琉	不	十	謫	凡	勿
璃	堅	三	人	夫	悲
脆	牢	歲	世	妻	啼

Father and mother, lay your grief aside;
 She was not fashioned for a mortal's bride—
 An angel banished from her place of birth,
 Condemned to spend a few short years on earth.
 The loveliest things are of the frailest make,
 Like clouds they vanish, and like glass they break.

Notes

1.—The prefatory remarks and the poem following are translated from the 圖書集成 *T'u shu chi ch'êng*, § xix, *chüan* 50.

2.—The 服鳥 *fu* is no doubt the screech-owl (*Scops sunia*, Hodgs.), a bird (*ulula*) of ill omen among the Romans; cf. Ruskin, *Prae-terita*, ii. 363: "I have found the owl's cry always prophetic of mischief to me." In the *T'u shu*, the *fu* is illustrated by the figure of a flying bird, taken from the 三才圖會, where it represents the 鵞鴟 eared owl, the *fu* being illustrated in the latter work by a somewhat similar bird perched upon the branch of a tree.

3.—A 單 閏 *shan o* year is one for which the cyclical denomination contains the character 卯 *mao*. As 賈 誼 Chia I was born in B.C. 200, and died in B.C. 168, this *shan o* year can only be 174; *kêng tzü*, below, is June 3.

4.—This line runs literally, "A strange thing came and settled," and the character 萃, as here used, calls for attention. It is defined in K'ang Hsi, with special reference to a line in the Odes, as "to collect together;" and Dr. Legge, following this authority, has translated the line,

And there are owls collecting on plum-trees.

Now, as owls do not "collect together," but are either solitary or in pairs, it would seem as though the name of the bird is at fault; as that, however, can hardly be the case, we must fall back on the analogy of 集, which, from birds collecting on a tree, comes to be used in the sense of "to settle." The line would then read,—

And there is an owl sitting on a plum-tree.

5.—Poe's raven tapped first at the door, and then at the window, through which it finally stepped in.

6.—Poe's books, to which he had recourse before the arrival of the raven, were of a different kind:

Vainly I had sought to borrow
From my books surcease of sorrow—
Sorrow for the lost Lenore.

7.—Six times Poe's raven uttered the words "Never more!"

8.—These last two lines will be found in the *Tao Tê Ching*.

Mr. LAUFER AND THE RHINOCEROS

The origin of this controversy was a suggestion to me by my son, Dr. Lionel Giles, when the 2nd edition of my Chinese-English Dictionary was passing through the press, that the words 犀 *hsi* and 兕 *ssü*, rendered by "rhinoceros" in the 1st edition, would be more correctly attributed, in accordance with Chinese figurings and literary tradition, to some bovine animal. This view appealed to me at once, but it has since met with severe handling by Mr. Laufer in the work mentioned below. A short critique of this book, by my son, appeared in the London and China Telegraph, Feb. 1, 1915, the merits of which were hotly disputed by Mr. Laufer in a later issue (March 8) of the same paper. In the following pages my son has dealt with the subject more at length, and at the end of his analysis, which I endorse (with slight reservations), I have myself added a few further remarks.

By Lionel Giles, D. Litt. (Oxon)

[The italicized passages should be regarded as notes.]

Chinese Clay Figures. I. Prolegomena on the History of Defensive Armor. By Berthold Laufer; Chicago, 1914.

The present volume, comprising nearly 250 pages and 72 plates, treats of the development of Chinese armour (the prefix "defensive" is surely superfluous) with special reference to the archaic, Han and T'ang periods. Coming from an archaeologist of Mr. Laufer's standing, such a work will necessarily command the attention of the sinological world. It bears unmistakable evidence of minute and patient research, the value of which will not be much impaired

even if some of Mr. Laufer's theories ultimately prove untenable. The most important of these theories, forming indeed the foundation on which the rest of the work is built up, is elaborated at great length in chapter I, and calls for special notice on account of the far-reaching conclusions which it involves. The earliest description of Chinese armour occurs in the *Chou Li*, ch. XLI, § 31. The passage is of the first importance, though unfortunately it leaves us in considerable uncertainty both as to the material employed and the exact method of manufacture. It begins thus: 函人爲甲、犀甲七屬、兕甲六屬、合甲五屬. Biot has a note here, in which he rather inclines to the belief that both 犀 and 兕 mean "buffalo," though in his translation he gives that meaning to 犀 only, and makes 兕 "rhinoceros."

Mr. Laufer, on the other hand, rejects the rendering "buffalo" entirely; according to him, *hsi* is the two-horned, *ssü* the single-horned rhinoceros. Furthermore, he asserts that the ancient Chinese, from the very beginning of their history, were acquainted with these two species of rhinoceros (p. 158), and that the words *hsi* and *ssü* retained this, their original meaning, until the extermination of the rhinoceros on Chinese soil, which event he seems to place in the 13th century A.D. or even later (p. 165). The word *ssü* was then transferred to the wild buffalo, while *hsi* was still retained as a general name for the rhinoceros (p. 162, note).

Mr. Laufer has not the gift of lucid and orderly exposition, and some of his statements are self-contradictory, so that, in order to weigh the evidence presented to us, it will be necessary to run through this chapter on the rhinoceros and discuss each point as it arises. Mistranslations will also be noted.

P. 74. Chu Hsi's opinion, that the *ssü* of the Classics was a 野牛 wild ox, deserves at any rate some consideration, and cannot be contemptuously brushed aside as "undoubtedly wrong."

- P. 75. With regard to the arguments put forward in *Adversaria*, vol. I, p. 394, it may frankly be admitted that Nos. 1 and 2 will not hold water. No. 3 has reference to the pictures of the *hsi* and the *ssü* in the *T'u Shu Chi Ch'êng*, which Mr. L. flatly declares "can never have been intended for any bovines," though he does not go so far as to say that they resemble, even remotely, any known species of rhinoceros. As a matter of fact, they were submitted to the late Professor Newton of Cambridge, and explicitly described as bovine by that eminent authority.
- P. 78. "Its body is as powerful as that of the elephant, but its feet are somewhat shorter." The Chinese is 身長如象足稍短. For "powerful," of course, read "long," and "legs" might be substituted for "feet."
- P. 83. It is implied that the *T'u Shu* illustration of the *ssü* shows three toes. This is not so; its hoof is clearly bipartite, while that of the *hsi* is not divided at all.
- P. 89. Mr. Laufer complains that the rendering "bovine animal" "leaves us entirely in the dark as to the difference between the two words *se* and *si*," which "are expressed by different symbols in writing." He does not appear to see that the argument tells with much greater force against his own theory, and that two so closely related sub-species as the single-horned and two-horned rhinoceros are not likely to have been denoted by two totally distinct characters.
- Take a passage like this in the 國語: 巴浦之犀犛兕象. Why should the writer insert the yak between two varieties of rhinoceros?
- P. 91. We now come to an important authority, the 說文, which was completed in 121 A.D. There can be no doubt that by this time the Chinese had become acquainted with

the rhinoceros through Indo-China, for the entry under 犀 points unmistakably to this animal.

That I was fully aware of this fact, which Mr. Laufer wastes a lot of breath in proving, may be gathered from the cross-reference under Rhinoceros in my Index to the T'u Shu Chi Ch'êng.

The description of it, however, as 南徼外牛 "an ox occurring beyond the southern frontier" seems fatal to Mr. Laufer's contention (which is essential to his theory) that rhinoceroses abounded in Central China, and even in Western Shansi, as late as the T'ang dynasty.

It is true that he makes a feeble attempt to meet the difficulty by assuming that 南徼外 indicates the country south of the Yangtse! This is quite inadmissible, but even so "the large number of se" in Shansi remains unexplained.

Let us now turn to the *Shuo Wên*'s definition of 兕 (the older name of the two, as Mr. Laufer admits): 如野牛而青 "Like a wild ox and dark-coloured." We have here, be it noted, absolutely no mention of the most characteristic feature of the rhinoceros—its horn.

Cf. what Kuo P'o says of the 犛 yak: 牛黑色出西南徼外 (quoted in commentary to 史記, ch. 117, f. 7 r^o). In his commentary on 爾雅, ch. 11, f. 17 v^o, he says of the yak, as he does of the ssü, that "it weighs 1000 catties."

Nor does any commentator on the *Shuo Wên* speak of the ssü as having a single horn. (Hsing Ping wrote a 疏 commentary on the *Érh Ya*, not on the *Shuo Wên*, as Mr. L. states.) The omission is inexplicable, unless we suppose that ssü continued to denote a species of wild buffalo long familiar to the Chinese, while *hsi* was borrowed as a name for the new and little-known beast whose habitat was in Indo-China.

- P. 94. "The horn on the nose . . . is small and not long." 小而
不擗 means "is small and is never shed;" *e.g.*, like deer's
antlers. 擗 here = 墮. The latter reading actually occurs
in similar contexts. See *P'ei Wên Yün Fu*, ch. 92, f. 17 v^o,
under 三角, and *T'u Shu*, XIX, 68, 游宦紀聞.

"The country Hu-siu." 胡休多國. The name of the
country is apparently Hu-hsiu-to.

- P. 95. Mr. Laufer says that the 角端 is a rhinoceros, and refers
us to the *Shih Chi* (loc. cit.). But the *hsi* and the *ssü* are
both separately mentioned in the same chapter. We may
well ask why, if all these are only different names for the
rhinoceros.

Again, in a list of 32 旗制 recognized subjects for banners
[*T'u Shu*, XXX, 269], the 19th is called 犀角旗, the
21st 兕旗, the 22nd 三角獸旗, and the 23rd 角端
旗. Are all four rhinoceroses?

"As we shall see, armor was not made in ancient China
from the hides of bovine animals." This is another corollary
to the rhinoceros proposition, which, needless to say, is never
proved, but lands its author in all manner of absurdities.
See *infra*, p. 181.

- P. 97, note. "Even the most skeptic critic of Chinese animal sketches
will be compelled to grant a certain foundation of fact to
the hog-like rhinoceros of the *Êrh Ya* (Fig. 6)." Mr. Laufer
would have been better advised to say nothing about the
two pictures in the *Êrh Ya*. Both are purely bovine in
character, except that the *hsi* has three toes to its hoof.
It is well known that these illustrations date only from the
Sung dynasty, and too much importance need not be attach-
ed to them. At the same time, one is certainly entitled
to ask how it is that no single picture of the *hsi*, the *ssü* or

anything else can be found which is in the least like a rhinoceros—an animal, be it remembered, which (according to Mr. Laufer) still abounded in central China during the T'ang dynasty (p. 164).



Fig. 9. The Ssü.

P. 101. "The animal *si* (Fig. 6) is undeniably represented in the *Erh ya t'u* with the body of a hog." Mr. Laufer appears to think that he has only to assert a thing loudly and long enough in order to make it true. I can only appeal to the judgment of any unprejudiced observer.

- [P. 101. "It is incorrect, however, to say that the animal *se* (= *ssü*), as outlined in the *T'u shu tsi ch'êng*, is the picture of an ox. In its general features it resembles a kind of deer, as does likewise the animal *si* (= *hsi*)."] [The two illustrations are here reproduced. H.A.G.]



The *Hsi*.

- P. 105. Mr. Laufer is surprised to find the *hsi* figured in the Japanese edition of the *San ts'ai t'u hui* with the head of a bull, and ascribes this to "the old tradition of the draughtsmen." Does not that bring him perilously near to the acceptance of a bovine original?

- P. 108. In Fig. 12 we have an illustration of the *hsi* taken from the 古玉圖譜, which, though thoroughly bovine in every particular, Mr. Laufer with quite pathetic assurance calls "the figure of a rhinoceros." It has obviously cloven feet, but this is explained by saying that the third toe is not visible!
- P. 114, note 5. 馬騮 is not read *chui*, but *hsi* (K'ang Hsi) or *hui* (Yen Shih-ku's commentary on *Han Shu*, ch. 28 b, 17 r°).
- P. 116. The whole argument from the Tibetan word *bseru* is worthless and beside the point. In the first place, Mr. Laufer only arrives at the desired conclusion by a liberal use of the fallacy of *petitio principii*. Secondly, the meaning of *bseru* in Tibet in the 9th century A.D., even if established, will not throw much light on the meaning of *hsi* and *ssü* in China a thousand years earlier. However, I have consulted some polyglot vocabularies, with the following result:
 四體合璧文鑑 gives 兕 as the equivalent of the Tibetan 'broñ, which means a wild yak. 御製四體清文鑑 gives 角端 as the equivalent of *bseru ma skad chan*, "the not-speaking bseru," which may quite possibly be the rhinoceros. For *bas*, however, which I understand to belong to the same root as *ba*, a cow, and *ba-men*, a gayal wild ox, 犀 is the equivalent given, and 'broñ is again rendered 兕. There is but cold comfort for Mr. Laufer here. As for the *bseru* shown in a Tibetan wood-engraving (fig. 14), it is hornless, and otherwise not unlike the *ssü* in the *T'u Shu*.

In note 1, Mr. Laufer ridicules the idea that a term which originally meant a bovine animal could later on have been applied to the rhinoceros. But, according to his own theory,

a term which originally meant a rhinoceros was afterwards applied to a bovine animal. Surely it is much easier to suppose that a newly discovered creature like the rhinoceros was called a buffalo in the Former Han period, than that a word which down to the 12th or 13th century A.D. had always denoted the one-horned rhinoceros should suddenly be transferred to the yak, an animal which was perfectly familiar to the Chinese long before that date, and which moreover had more than one name of its own.

P. 118, note 2. 銀冶犀鹿 is translated "silver-cast figures of a rhinoceros and a stag." But *hsi-lu*, I think, is a compound word similar to *hsi-niu*, and denotes a single animal partly cervine, partly bovine in character.

Pp. 124—129 contain a digression on the subject of the ostrich, which under the name 駝鳥 is depicted in the *T'u Shu* as a grotesque two-legged camel with wings. The argument put forward is that if a Chinese draughtsman could go so far astray in representing the ostrich, we must not be surprised at his failure to reproduce the correct features of the rhinoceros. The answer, of course, is that the two cases are not parallel. The ostrich has admittedly never been seen on Chinese soil, and had to be reconstructed entirely from hearsay. The rhinoceros, on the other hand, if Mr. Laufer's theory is correct, was "plentiful in many parts of China."

P. 129. Mr. Laufer has made a terrible hash of his translation from the *Po ku t'u lu*. My own version will in each case be given immediately after the Chinese text. He begins: "The two lateral ears of the vessel are connected by a handle, on which are chased two characters in the shape of a rhinoceros." . . . 盖與器銘共二字作兕形.

On the cover and on the body of the vessel two characters in all are engraved (*i. e.* one on each) representing the form of a *ssü*.

- P. 131. "On the two ends of the handle of this vessel is pictured a rhinoceros with head and body complete, the latter having the shape of a glutton."

A glance at the accompanying illustration shows that this translation must be wrong. The 耳 ears mentioned above are evidently referred to. Each represents *the head of an ox*.

是器提梁之兩端亦象兕首、而通體作饕餮狀. At each end of the handle there is also represented the head of a *ssü*, while the body of the vessel is covered with *t'ao-t'ieh* figures.

"In this manner all vessels were decorated during the Shang dynasty, and it is by such symbolic forms that they are distinguished from those of the Chou." 商尚質、於是銘諸器者或以其形、此所以與周器異耳。The Shang dynasty esteemed solidity (as opposed to the merely ornamental), and so it was perhaps that the engravers of the period used that form (*i. e.* the *ssü*). This is what distinguishes its vessels from those of the Chou dynasty.—From among the illustrations of the *Po ku t'u lu* (a work, by the way, which Mr. Laufer himself has done more than any other scholar to discredit), two sketches of the *ssü* are reproduced on p. 130, in which our author professes to see the single-horned rhinoceros "clearly outlined with a naïve and refreshing realism." By far the most noticeable feature of this drawing is a *bristling mane*, not alluded to by Mr. Laufer. It need hardly be pointed out that a mane is not characteristic of the rhinoceros.

A similar mane appears on the *hsi* as depicted in the *Pên Ts'ao*, ch. 51, f. 3 v⁰, as well as on the 犛牛 (wild yak) on the same page.

As to the single horn, I have little doubt that what here looks like the upper part of the snout really represents the other horn curling towards the one above it. Some corroboration of this is afforded by an ancient form of 兕 given in the 六書分類, which shows the two horns more plainly, while agreeing in the other respects with the picture in the *Po ku t'u lu*. It will be worth while to consider this character 兕 more closely.

The *Shuo Wên* tells us that it is a 象形 pictorial form, and this is confirmed by early examples on bronzes, which unmistakably suggest a quadruped with two large horns springing from the same base on the top of the head.

See *Iü shu fên lei*, ch. 1, f. 33 v⁰. Of the 13 ancient forms given, only two seem to indicate a single horn. These two are utterly different from the rest, and Mr. L. C. Hopkins agrees with me that they cannot be original forms of 兕. Several old forms of 象 "elephant" show a precisely similar projection on top of the head. The ancient examples of the character to be found in the 藝文備覽 suggest two rounded horns like those of the water-buffalo. The 薛氏鐘鼎款識, ch. 1, f. 13, reproduces a bronze cauldron of the Shang dynasty with the inscription 兕父癸鼎. The animal, as it appears in the British Museum copy, has no horn and cannot easily be identified with any known species.

The modern character, of course, still shows these two horns. They are distinctly bovine in appearance. It is inconceivable that any rhinoceros, let alone the single-horned species, should have been thus depicted.

An analysis of the character 犀 leads to results even more startling. In the first place, let us note that Li Shih-chên calls it a pictogram—not a phonetic compound. It may therefore be inferred that each of its parts has some value in determining the sense. These two parts are 尾 “tail” and 牛 “ox.”

Even supposing that Li Shih-chên was mistaken in this point, it is extremely improbable that the choice of 尾 to serve as a phonetic in conjunction with 牛 was purely fortuitous.

An ox with a remarkable tail, then, seems to be clearly indicated. Now, an animal corresponding to this description—the yak—has been known in China from the earliest times. On the other hand, if there is one part of the rhinoceros which is wholly inconspicuous and therefore less likely than any other to be singled out for notice, it is its tail.

Pp. 133—153 are taken up with extracts from the *Pên Ts'ao* and other works. They simply swarm with mistranslations, which in one or two cases seriously affect the argument.

P. 135. “The symbol for the word *si* still has in the 篆文 seal character the form of a pictogram, and is the name for the female rhinoceros. The *se* is styled also ‘sand-rhinoceros’.”

犀字篆文象形、其特名兕、亦曰沙犀。
The character for *hsi* in seal script is a pictorial form. The female is called *ssü*, also *sha-hsi*.

P. 136. “It has two horns; the horn on the forehead is the one used in fighting.” 犀有二角、以額上者爲勝。
The *hsi* has two horns; the one on the forehead is considered to be superior in quality.

“Whereby its wonderful properties are tested” should be
“with wonderful results.”

P. 138. “Scarcely have they approached the horn to within an

inch." 未至數寸。Before they have reached the horn by several inches.

"Enveloped by a thick fog or exposed to the night dew" should be "on nights when there is a thick mist or heavy dew."

"The rhinoceros (*si*) is a wild animal living in the deep mountain forests. During dark nights," etc. This is only one sentence: "On pitch-dark nights, when the *hsi* is in the depths of the mountain forests."

"A white foam will bubble up, and no other test is necessary." The apodosis 則了無復勢也 means "the poison is neutralized, and has no further power."

P. 139. "In the following year, it moves to another place to shed its horn." 後年輒更解角著其處。Then in subsequent years it will come back to shed its horn in the same place.—It is curious that Mr. Laufer should have missed the whole point of this practice.

"The patterns on its horn are smooth, spotted, white, and clearly differentiated." 文理膩細、斑白分明。The patterns on its horn are glossy and fine to the eye, the white and the mottled portions being well contrasted. The same mistake occurs on p. 150.

P. 140, note 7. With regard to the supposed formidable nature of the tongue of the rhinoceros, mentioned by Marco Polo, it ought to be noted that the very same fable was current in connection with the wild yak. (See Yule and Cordier's edition of Marco Polo, vol. I, p. 277, note 3.) Other genuine characteristics of this animal—its fierceness, huge size and black colour—may also have contributed to its confusion with the rhinoceros.

P. 141, note. "The Po-se designate ivory as *po-ngan*, and rhinoceros-

horn as *hei-ngan*,—words difficult to distinguish.” 波斯呼象牙爲白暗、犀角爲黑暗、言難識也。The Persians call ivory *po-an* (white-secret) and rhinoceros-horn *hei-an* (black-secret), meaning that they are mysterious substances.—In a note on p. 145, Mr. Laufer says that a similar passage “makes no sense,” which ought to have warned him of his error.

P. 142. “Its hoofs and feet are like those of the elephant. It has a double armor.” 蹄脚似象、蹄有二甲。Its feet are like those of the elephant, with two toes to each foot.—Cf. p. 93, where mention is made of 三甲 three toes. 鼻上皆裙口束。Mr. Laufer, evidently not understanding these words, has omitted them. They appear to mean: “The horn on the nose is always bunched together like a skirt tied at the waist.”

P. 143. “These are pointed, and their designs are large and numerous. Those with small designs are styled *tao ch'a t'ung*.” 尖花大而振花小者、謂之倒插通。Those in which the tip-markings are large and the markings at the base are small, are called *tao ch'a t'ung*.—For 振, which is unintelligible, I adopt the variant 根 given in the 埤雅. “If there is not sufficient space for the lines to pass through, and the white and black designs are equally distributed:” 若通無處白黑花分差奇。If at no place do any lines pass straight through, and the white and black markings are distributed in a curious, uneven way.

“Then the price is considerably increased, and the horn will become the treasure of numberless generations.” 則計價巨萬、舉世之寶也。Then the value is enormously enhanced, and the horn will be an heirloom for ever.—The stop should come after 萬, not after 巨.

“Girdle-plaques and implements.” 胯具 is a single expression—“girdle-plaques.” The *Pên Ts'ao* text has 帶胯.

P. 144. “In the evening.” 經夕 must mean “all night.”

P. 145. Wu Shi-kao, a physician from Ch'êng shi mên. 成式門下醫人吳士皇。The physician, Wu Shih-káo, a disciple of the school of Ch'êng Shih.

P. 147. “There is also the *chên ch'u*, which is presumably a rhinoceros.” 有鵠處、必有犀也。Wherever the *chên* bird is found, there are sure to be *hsi*.—Cf. *P'ei Wên Yün Fu*, ch. 26 a, f. 83 r⁰: 有鵠之地、必有犀牛。[See *post*, by H. A. G.]

“And so they go ahead continually. If they would go to work openly,” etc. 再三不離其處、若直取之。This may happen several times running without causing the rhinoceros to abandon the spot; whereas if they were simply to take away the horns (without substituting artificial ones)....

“The rhinoceros.... beholds the forms of things passing across the sky, and these are reproduced in the horn of the embryo.” 見天上物過、形於角上。The natural objects which it sees up in the sky become embodied in its horn.—形 is here a verb.

“When the horn, placed in a water-basin during a moonlight night, reflects the brilliancy of the moon, it is manifest that it is a genuine horn ‘communicating with the sky’.” 但于月下以水盆映之、則知。This [i. e. the fact that celestial objects are reproduced in the horn] can be verified by simply placing it in a bowl of water exposed to the rays of the moon.

P. 148. “None equals the patterns in the horn of the Tibetan breed, which are high, and come out clearly at both ends.” 皆不及西番者、紋高兩脚顯也。None of

these horns equals that of the Tibetan breed, in which the lines rise up high and the two "feet" are clearly marked.—I do not know exactly what the 兩脚 are, but they certainly refer to markings in the horn, and cannot mean "both ends."

"If the black color is taken as standard, and the forms of the design are imitative of real objects, the horn is a treasure." 蓋以烏色爲正、以形像肖物爲貴。Black is taken as the standard colour, and those horns are most valued in which the shapes resemble natural objects. "If both ends are moist and smooth." 有兩脚潤澤者。 . . . and if the "two feet" are glossy in appearance.—No tactile quality can be in question here. The protasis of this sentence begins with 文頭 etc. Mr. Laufer has here taken only the latter part, including the rest in his previous sentence.

- P. 149. "And occurs there everywhere." This is not in the Chinese. 諸處 merely sums up the places enumerated. "There is, further, a hairy rhinoceros, resembling the mountain-rhinoceros and living in hilly forests." 又有毛犀似之、山犀居山林。 There is also a hairy *hsi* which resembles them (the other three species). The *shan hsi* lives in mountain forests. "The water-rhinoceros makes its permanent abode in water." 水犀出入水中。 The *shui hsi* is amphibious.

- P. 150. "The *se si* is the female of the rhinoceros which is termed also 'sand-rhinoceros'." 兕犀即犀之特者、亦曰沙犀。 The *ssü-hsi* is the female of the *hsi*; it is also called *sha-hsi*.

The rhinoceros sent as tribute from Annam was, according to Mr. Laufer's view, a *ssü*. Why should it be called a

one-horned *hsi*? The answer is obvious if the ordinary *hsi* was a wild yak.

"The term 'hairy rhinoceros' is at present applied to the yak." 今並正之。毛犀即旄牛也。These mistakes may now be corrected *en bloc*. The hairy *hsi* is the yak. *This statement is important evidence against Mr. Laufer's theory, though by means of an astounding mistranslation he makes it appear just the reverse. It is clear, however, that Li Shih-chên himself has not altogether avoided the confusion between wild yak and rhinoceros. His 水犀, with its "pearl-like armour," and horns on nose and forehead, can only be the rhinoceros, while the 山犀, which has no armour, is almost certainly a buffalo. The 旄 (or 牦) 牛, of which an account is given in the same chapter of the Pên Ts'ao, is a smaller variety of 犛 wild yak. Of the latter animal it is stated that "its body and horns are like those of the hsi." Further on, we learn that its horn could be used to counterfeit rhinoceros-horn so closely that no one could tell the difference. It was used for "the manufacture of bows of exceeding stiffness."*

"If the decorations are spotted, as it were, with pepper and beans, the horns are middle grade." 花如椒豆斑者次之。Next in quality come the horns in which the decoration consists of spots like peppercorns.

P. 151, note 1. Mr. Laufer rightly corrects previous writers who have made 溫嶠 Wên Ch'iao 燃犀 "light a rhinoceros-horn" in order to behold the monsters of the deep. He does not, however, explain how the mistake arose. The text of the *Chin Shu* runs: 燬犀角而照之 "he took a luminous rhinoceros-horn and directed its rays on to it [the river]." 燬 does not mean "to light," but "blaze" or "bright," and the Chinese themselves, misunder-

standing the passage, have got into the habit of quoting it with the incorrect gloss 燃.

Mr. Laufer translates 影犀 "shadow-horn." But 影 here means "reflection," not "shadow." So on p. 141, note. Note 2. Mr. Laufer's theory compels him to reject the well-established tradition of a white *hsi*, mentioned in the *Shan hai ching*, the 東觀漢記 *Tung kuan han chi* and the 唐律典 *T'ang lü tien*. No white rhinoceros exists, whereas the white yak is a well known variety.

Pp. 156—158. The argument based on the fossil remains of *Rhinoceros antiquitatis* found in China will only impress those who do not realise the vastness of geological periods. It is ridiculous to think that the existence of certain extinct species of rhinoceros in China during the Pliocene and early Pleistocene periods—hundreds of thousands of years ago—can have any bearing on the question at issue. The Straits of Dover did not then exist, and the woolly rhinoceros roamed over England, but Mr. Laufer does not infer from that, I presume, that its descendants still inhabited this country in historical times.

P. 161. The famous passage in the *Tao Tê Ching*: 兕無所投其角, points to some animal which, unlike the rhinoceros, uses its horns as weapons of offence.

Note 5 is a singularly lame attempt to prove that the rhinoceros must have given its name to the buffalo, as being the more familiar animal, and not *vice versa*. We are not told by what name the buffalo was called before the 12th century, though we can frame a good guess from the fact (admitted by Mr. L.), that the *T'ang Shu* and *Sung Shih* both speak of the water-buffalo as 水兕.

Once more I am indebted to Mr. Laufer for calling atten-

tion to a text which tells heavily in my favour. The 詞林海錯 says: 唐書犀鎧, 今之水牛通謂之犀 "As regards the *hsi*-armour of the T'ang History, the water-buffalo of the present day used to be generally known by the name of *hsi*." Comment is superfluous.

In his own ingenious way, Mr. Laufer twists this into the following: "What is designated rhinoceros-hide armor [observe the usual *petitio principii*] in the T'ang History is at present made from buffalo-hide, but continues under the general name 'rhinoceros' (*si*)."

Correct also note 3 on p. 190.

And from this he coolly infers that the Chinese "were perfectly aware of the fact that the ancient cuirasses were wrought from rhinoceros-hide, and that buffalo-hide was a later substitute!"

- P. 165. Mr. Laufer quotes from the Sung History, 五行志: "In the year 987.... a rhinoceros penetrated from the southern part of K'ien into Wan-chou [near the eastern border of Ssü-ch'uan] where people seized and slew it, keeping its skin and horn." To be thus recorded in the dynastic history, the above must have been considered an extraordinary event. Yet, in face of this, we are asked to believe that under the T'ang dynasty—comparatively few years before—the rhinoceros abounded in Hunan and Hupeh!
- P. 167. The question of the so-called 兕觥, which Mr. Laufer calls "rhinoceros-horn cups," is by no means to be disposed of off-hand (see *post*, by H.A.G.). As he remarks, none of these ancient drinking-horns has survived, but at a later time they were imitated in bronze, and it is chiefly on these bronze reproductions that we have to rely. One of them, from the *Chin Shih So*, is shown in fig. 24, with

the uncompromising legend 周兕觥. Mr. Laufer's honesty in reprinting this sketch is certainly to be commended, for it is undeniably an *ox-horn* cup, carved (as if to make assurance doubly sure) into a cervine head with *ox-horns* at the base. Not a whit disconcerted, however, he declares that "the *se kung* of antiquity are certainly cups carved from rhinoceros-horn, not cups of buffalo-horn." Nay, he goes further, and tells us that "the horn of a bovine animal cannot be carved... a cup carved from a horn can mean nothing but one carved from rhinoceros-horn." He has evidently forgotten his own translation from the *Ch'un ts'ao t'ang chi* (p. 162, note), where the author says that "the cups and dishes carved from rhinoceros-horn (犀角) in his time are not from the genuine rhinoceros (水犀) but from the horn of a wild ox (野牛)." This is a significant passage in more directions than one. Further, the *Drikkehorn og Sølvtøj*, by Olrik (Copenhagen, 1909), is full of illustrations of ox-horns beautifully carved.

P. 168. Mr. Laufer translates a note by Fan Ch'êng-ta: "The people on the sea-coast make cups from ox-horn by splitting the horn in two," etc., and calls particular attention to the fact that they did not *carve* their cups from ox-horn, but merely split the latter. The word in the Chinese text is 截 which means not "to split," but "to cut," and certainly warrants no such deduction. The horns in figs. 23 and 24 have evidently been cut through the middle, not split longitudinally. It is clear that drinking-cups can be thus fashioned to any smaller size required, which disposes of the argument that no drinker could empty one at a draught.

P. 169, note. "The *Chou li* describes the rhinoceros-horn as yellow."

This contains a double blunder. 犀膠黃 means "the glue made from *hsi* hide is yellow." The commentator 王昭禹 Wang Chao-yü expressly tells us that in the case of the *hsi* the hide only is used for making glue. With regard to the 角人 horn-collectors (*Chou Li*, XVI, 34), the rhinoceros, as we have already seen (p. 94), does not shed its horn. It is in the highest degree unlikely, then, that the horns collected were those of the rhinoceros.

P. 172. "It is utterly inconceivable, however, that the ancient Chinese should have taken the trouble to hunt wild bovine animals, in order to secure their skins for cuirasses, since they were in possession of plenty of domestic cattle from which leather was obtainable." Apart from the probability that wild buffalo hide was thicker and stronger than that of ordinary cattle, a little reflection would have suggested to Mr. Laufer that tame oxen were too valuable for agricultural purposes to be killed for the sake of their leather. As he himself observes on the very next page, "the ox was a sacred, and in a measure inviolable animal, looked upon as the helpmate in gaining man's daily bread."

Pp. 175—181. Having established to his own satisfaction that 兕 and 犀 have from time immemorial been used only to designate the single-horned and two-horned rhinoceros respectively, Mr. Laufer returns to the all-important passage in the *Chou Li* from which we started. He offers a new and ingenious interpretation of the word 屬 (to be read *chu*⁴, not *shu*³) which Biot, following the Chinese commentators, translates "pièces cousues." In Mr. Laufer's opinion, it can only mean "layers" or thicknesses of hide, but he altogether ignores the many objections to such a rendering.

In the first place, it does not fit in well with the account that follows of the actual construction of a cuirass. For instance: 以其長爲之圍。This is translated: "The long strips, into which the hide has been cut up, are laid around horizontally." But I can find nothing about "strips." 其 refers to the hide pieces, of which, as Biot says, "on prend la longueur totale pour faire le contour de la cuirasse." 眡其鑽空、欲其窻也。眡其裏、欲其易也。眡其朕、欲其直也。"The stitches, when examined, must be fine and close; the inner side of the hide must be smooth; the seams are required to be straight." Or again: 衣之、欲其無齟也 "When it is worn, there should be no gap at the seams." [Biot: "que les coutures ne grimacent pas." Mr. Laufer's "it must not wrinkle" (translated from Biot) has not hit the meaning. See K'ang Hsi.] This refers to pieces of leather laid side by side and sewn together, not to layers. But there are more cogent reasons still why this ancient hide armour cannot have been made in as many as seven layers, especially if rhinoceros hide was the material used. This, when dried, is of "iron-like hardness" (p. 82). Yet we know from a passage in Sun Tzū (VII, 7) that it was customary for soldiers to roll up their corselets when on the march (卷甲而趨). This would be a difficult feat to accomplish with a single thickness of rhinoceros hide, to say nothing of seven. Mr. Laufer hardly meets this difficulty by assuming that the hide "was cut up in horizontal sections into large and thin sheets," which were tightly pressed together.

This appears to be an afterthought, which unfortunately is totally at variance with the "long strips" mentioned above. The labour and costliness of such a process (not even hinted

at in the *Chou Li*) render it extremely improbable. Whatever hide was employed, full advantage was doubtless taken of its natural thickness. Another interesting fact which emerges from Sun Tzū and other early writers is that the use of such armour was universal amongst the rank and file. That is to say, the military equipment of each State must have included tens or even hundreds of thousands of these leather corselets. Can it seriously be maintained that rhinoceroses were slaughtered in sufficient numbers to supply such an enormous demand?

- P. 181. Mr. Laufer asserts that no buffalo-hide (or that of any bovine animal) was used for armour until the T'ang period. But 程大昌 Ch'êng Ta-ch'ang, in an essay contained in the 武備志 *Wu pei chih*, ch. 105, f. 21, specifies ox-hide as one of the materials used for armour in the Chou period, and goes on to mention a cuirass made of water-buffalo hide which belonged to 勾踐 Kou Chien (circa 500 B.C.). Then, after relating the story of 馬隆 Ma Lung and the loadstone (Laufer, p. 183), he continues: 王隱晉書亦載其事、乃曰、隆兵悉著牛皮鎧得過、則是實用牛皮爲之、而名以爲犀焉耳。 "Wang Yin's *Chin Shu* also contains this incident, and he adds: 'Lung's troops were able to pass because they were all clad in ox-hide armour.' This armour, then, was really made out of ox-hide, and only went under the name of *hsi*." By the term *hsi* in this passage Ch'êng may or may not have meant a rhinoceros. If so, it illustrates the confusion between that and the bovine genus which Mr. Laufer so categorically denies. Further, if ox-hide was used for armour in the 3rd century, it may very well have been used long before.

It appears then that Mr. Laufer's theory of the rhinoceros in China is radically unsound. The imposing fabric so laboriously constructed in these pages has its foundations in the sand and is not strong enough to stand against the searching winds of criticism. I have naturally been at more pains to reveal the weaknesses and inconsistencies of my opponent's position than to work out a detailed theory of my own. Mr. Laufer is fully entitled to make the most of this fact, and to contrast the definiteness of his own opinion with the comparative vagueness of "wild bovine animal" as a rendering for *hsi* and *ssü*. Nevertheless, his case is not really strengthened thereby. It is more than likely that in early times the Chinese conception of a *ssü* was itself fairly vague, and included more than one species of wild ox. Speaking with all reserve, as one who does not profess to be a zoologist, I should say that the *dong* or wild yak has strong claims to be regarded, at any rate, as one of the bovine species thus indicated. Being a gregarious animal, its former distribution in large numbers over the face of China presents far fewer difficulties than is the case with the rhinoceros. The single horn is certainly a later addition, due to confusion with the latter animal, and possibly to unicorn fables imported from India and Persia.

By H. A. G.

For my part, I have already stated that Mr. Laufer is a valuable asset as an archaeologist, but I have elsewhere (*Adversaria Sinica*, vol. I, pp. 305, 386) shown that he is not qualified to translate Chinese. Besides the mistakes already pointed out by my son, there

are, as he states, a great many left untouched. Let me give a striking example. On p. 144, Mr. Laufer translates thus: "When the animal is immersed in the water, men avail themselves of this opportunity to capture it, as it is impossible for it to pull its feet out of the mud." Could anything, on the face of it, be more ridiculous? According to this, a rhinoceros could always be caught when bathing; and that would be very frequently, as Mr. Laufer himself says (p. 136, note 4) that "the rhinoceros is fond of spending the hot hours of the day immersed in water." Besides, it may be added, even when not attacked, the animal would always have the same difficulty in pulling its feet out of the mud. The text, which is really of the simplest, runs thus: 當其溺時人赴不復移足, and it is almost an insult to tell a student of Chinese of any standing that it means, "*When it is urinating, men take advantage of its inability to move its feet.*" [Compare this with another statement about the rhinoceros, viz. 小便竟日不盡.] Again, on p. 147 we have, "There is also the *chén ch'u*, which is presumably a rhinoceros." The text is 有鳩處必有犀. The second character refers to a "poisonous bird" of a fabulous reputation, from which the word comes to be used adjectivally in the sense of "poisonous." We can hardly think that the writer was here alluding to the bird, whereas the adjective offers no difficulty: "In poisonous places, the *hsi* is always found."

It is useless to pile up such misrenderings; quite enough has been said to show that Mr. Laufer is absolutely unqualified to handle a Chinese text. The question therefore arises as to the value of theories raised upon a superstructure of gross mistranslation.

I will now translate a passage from the 埤雅, quoted in the *T'u shu*, XIX, 68, which has so far been omitted altogether from the controversy. "The 釋獸 *Shih shou* says, The 兕 *ssü* is like an ox; its skin is hard and thick, and armour can be made from

it. The *Tso chuan* says, In the water destroy dragons, and on land exterminate the *hsi* and the *ssü*;—for it (armour) is got from these. The 吉日 Lucky Day ode says, Let fly at that small boar, kill that big *ssü*;—meaning that ability to hit (with a cross-bow) a small animal will imply the power of vanquishing big ones. Lao Tzū says, The *ssü* will then have no place in which to stick its horn. The *ssü* is very good at butting; therefore the drinking penalties of our ancient rulers were enforced in goblets made from the horn of the *ssü*. Wine belongs to the *yang* (or male) principle, and is good for bringing out a man's courage; taken in excess, it leads to "butting," and therefore our ancient rulers made this horn a warning emblem against drunkenness. The Canon of Poetry says, Crumpled is the goblet made from the *ssü* horn, With its good wine and mild;—referring to the above."

I gather from the above that the *ssü*, at or about a date of more than a thousand years before Christ, could be killed with a cross-bow, and had the 觥 (= 斛 = 曲) crumpled horn of a buffalo. The tradition has always been of a large horn goblet, said to hold as much as seven 升 pints, and sometimes, by exaggeration, said to require three men to lift it. This goblet, now 觥, was originally 觥, a name given to it, according to 徐鉉 Hsü Hsüan, because of its 曲起之貌 crumpled appearance.

If Mr. Laufer claims to find the horn for such a goblet on the head of a rhinoceros, I am obliged to part company with him in the quest for truth.

通 天

The above phrase requires a short note to itself. It seems to have been first used in connexion with a 臺 raised building, set up by the Emperor Wu of the Han dynasty, as a place of worship,

in the year B.C. 109. The Emperor's chief object is stated to have been 招來神仙 "to attract divine beings," for which purpose three hundred boys and girls, eight years of age, were sent up 以候天神 to await the arrival of the angels; and such a building would rightly be understood as "communicating with heaven," the habitat of such beings. Under the Later Han dynasty, which ended A.D. 206, the term appears in the combination 通天冠, a name for an Imperial cap, the form of which was said to have been handed down from the beginning of the 11th century B.C. (*T'u shu*, xxvii, 327).

This cap is described in the 輿服志 of the Later Han history as "nine inches in height, standing straight up, with the top 少斜 slightly inclined to one side." The *P'ei wên*, which gives the last entry, follows it up by a line from a poet, named 王



通天冠

損 Wang Sun, whose date I have failed to discover:

犀有異角其名通天

The *hsi* has a strange horn, which is called *t'ung t'ien*

Ko Hung (*died* A.D. 330), mentions a 真通天犀角 translated by Mr. Laufer (p. 138) "a genuine rhinoceros-horn of the kind 'communicating with the sky,' three inches long." T'ao Hung-ching (A.D. 452—536), also mentions a 通天犀, translated by Mr. Laufer as "a kind of rhinoceros styled 'communicating with the sky.'" Finally, the words occur as part of the year-title of the Empress Wu, A.D. 696, of course in their original sense.

From the above it appears that our term was first applied in literature to a sacrificial building; then to a cap said to be of a much earlier date, which we can accept in so far as the Hans are known to have taken over the style of regalia in use among the 秦 Ch'ins; and later to the horn of a rhinoceros. This looks as if the rhinoceros-horn was called "communicating with the sky" merely because it was like the shape of a well-known cap, "slightly inclined to one side," and not, as Mr. Laufer supposes, because "the rhinoceros is associated with material heaven; that is, the sky," for which no rational explanation is forthcoming beyond the absurd stories faked by the Chinese to explain a term which they did not understand. Even if 通天, associated with a species of rhinoceros, had occurred in literature before its association with a cap, the Chinese would in that case probably have named this headgear "the rhinoceros cap," and not "the communicating-with-the-sky cap." Further, on the cap may be seen lines running from the base to the top, which probably suggested the original name; and when a rhinoceros-horn was noted for similar peculiarities, it would be a simple step to associate the curiously marked and slightly inclined horn with the Imperial cap quite recently, if not then, still in use.

ANOTHER MISTRANSLATOR

A paper entitled "Ink Remains," by John C. Ferguson, Ph.D., published in volume XLV (1914) of the Journal of the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, cannot fairly be passed over in silence. We are told that it is "a translation of the introduction and list of paintings" found in the work of a Korean who flourished under the Emperor Kang (*sic*) Hsi; and the writer excuses himself by saying, "It is not easy to be certain in every instance that I have caught the governing idea of the name of each painting." Neither is it easy for an ordinary student to say if the introduction has been correctly translated, the Chinese text not being given; it is only easy to show that the transliteration of proper names, which are given in footnotes, is a hopeless and inaccurate jumble. Aspirates are rarely put in; on p. 15 we find four examples of 唐 Tang, and only one of T'ang. On p. 16 we have 沈 Shen and 展 Chên, the latter being a misreading for Chan. As the transliteration of 仇英實父, we have Chiu Shih-fu, instead of Ch'iu Ying, styled Shih-fu; but it would be waste of space to mention any more of these lapses, much as they detract from a desirable standard of Chinese scholarship.

When we reach the list of pictures on p. 17, the proper names in which are all written without aspirates, it becomes at once apparent that Dr. Ferguson was justified in anticipating his inability to catch "the governing idea of the name of each painting." For instance, we have 觀鵝 rendered by "Watching the Goose," which it might conceivably be, instead of by "Watching Geese," which it undoubtedly

must be; 寒山行旅 by "Wintry Hills" by Kuan Tung (*sic*), instead of "Travelling across Wintry Hills," an omission repeated in the case of a picture by Fan Kuan (*sic*); 江行初雪 by "The First Snow," instead of by "Travelling on the Yangtze in an early Snowfall;" 匡廬清曉 by "Light on the Hills," instead of "A Clear Dawn on Mt. K'uang-lu;" 溪山樓觀 by "Looking down the Valley," instead of "View from a storeyed building on Mount Ch'i;" 夢游瀛山 by "A Dream Journey," instead of "A Dream Journey to Fairyland;" 煙江疊嶂 by "Fog on the River," instead of "Ranges of Peaks seen through Mist on the River;" 溪山蘭若 by "A Flowery Glen," instead of "A Hermitage on Mount Ch'i." Finally, we have 米友仁大姚村妹家所作雲山圖 disposed of by "A copy of a Snow Scene—by Mi Fei." This and the next two pictures are equally attributed to Mi Fei, who of course had nothing to do with them. His son Mi Yu-jen, here mentioned, is described as 亦善書畫 also good at calligraphy and painting, and is mentioned in my "Introduction to the History of Chinese Pictorial Art," p. 117. Besides, what has Dr. Ferguson done with the "little sister" and the village? And why is 雲 cloud translated by snow?

There are three more closely printed pages of this class of work, through which it would be further waste of space to wade. An entry, taken at random, on p. 18, reads 竹梧蘭石四清, and is translated by "Four Clear Things." To make sense, this should be, "The bamboo, *wu-t'ung* tree, orchids, and rocks,—the Four Pure Things." Another entry on p. 19 reads 雷春消息, and is translated by "After a Spring Thunderstorm." Of course the time suggested is *before*—not a thunderstorm, but the spring, which is announced by thunder.

It is difficult to see of what value such a contribution can be to anybody, correct translation being the only vehicle by which Chinese thought can be satisfactorily transferred into another tongue.

From other sources, it seems certain that Dr. Ferguson cannot translate accurately the simplest Chinese phrases. There is an article of his, entitled "Wang Ch'uan" in the *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift*, April—June, 1914, p. 51, which is full of glaring mistranslations, coupled with the usual blemishes of wrong transliteration. Before proceeding to examine a selection of these, I will ask attention to the following criticism; not in an antagonistic spirit, but with the desire of finding out the real truth, which with Dr. Ferguson's access to native help, may very well turn out to be on his side. He says (p. 59), "Giles has translated 界畫 *chieh-hua* as "boundary painting," and explains this curious name by the phrase "putting a landscape into a given space" (*i. e.*, instead of carrying it along a scroll until the painter feels inclined to stop). However, the name *chieh-hua* does not refer to landscape, but to buildings in a landscape. These buildings should be correctly drawn as to dimensions, and when such correctly drawn buildings are the chief feature of a picture, the picture is called *chieh-hua*." This does not seem to me to ring true, and I should be glad to have it either verified or denied. On p. 54 will be found a list of place-names, among which we have "鹿柴 *Lu Chai* (*sic*) The Deer Park." [Park is also given on the same page, and more correctly, as a translation of 園.] On p. 55 a verse is quoted with the heading "*Lu Chai* (*sic*)," which is rendered by Dr. Ferguson as follows:—

In the lone hills men are not seen
Only the sound of their voices is heard.
The fading light enters the deep forest.
The reflection is on the green moss.

Now the reflection which I have to make is that the last two lines yield no meaning of any reasonable kind, and may therefore, in justice to the Chinese poet, be dismissed from consideration. Here is the Chinese of the whole verse, not provided by Dr. Ferguson, read left to right:

空	山	不	見	人
但	聞	人	語	響
返	景	入	深	林
復	照	青	苔	上

I admit that this beautiful "stop-short" is scarcely transferable into English. The sense, however, may be shown, as follows:—

On the lone hills no one is to be seen,
 But the sound of voices can be heard.
 The shadows go back into the forest,
 And once again there is light on the green moss.

Of course 但 does not mean "only," as Dr. Ferguson puts it; the contrast is between men unseen and *nevertheless* voices heard. Lines 3 and 4 have reference to the setting sun, which in the morning casts the shadows of the forest westward, and now sends them back eastward into the forest, once more illumining the green moss on the west. Compare the well-known line

Soles occidere et redire possunt.

Let us examine another "stop-short," entitled 竹里館 and rendered by Dr. Ferguson (p. 54) as "The Bamboo Rest House," which leaves out the second character (= Village) altogether, and gives quite a wrong meaning to the phrase. Here is Dr. Ferguson's translation (p. 60):

Sitting alone where the bamboo grows
 The harp sings to me its sweet tune
 Hid by the trees where no man knows
 I am greeted with light from the moon.

An allowance must be made for a versified rendering, but only on condition that it does not violate the sense of the original, here provided by Dr. Ferguson (left to right):

獨	坐	幽	篁	裏
彈	琴	復	長	嘯
深	林	人	不	知
明	月	來	相	照

Sitting alone in a dark bamboo grove,
 I strike my lute and sing loud and long;
 But there is no one in the depths of this wood who understands
 (my lay),
 Until the bright moon comes to shed her light (she does).

The above extracts are quoted by Dr. Ferguson in reference to an achievement of Wang Wei (A.D. 699—759), who like Dante Gabriel Rossetti of modern days, wrote a poem and painted a picture on one and the same subject. In Wang Wei's case the picture was a landscape, and Dr. Ferguson (p. 58) translates some eulogistic verses, describing the picture, from the pen of 袁楠 Yüan Nan, as follows:

The idea of a picture is preserved in a poem
 The wealth of a poem is seen in a picture
 There is no bringing back the colors of the hills
 The clouds fold and unfold their hues
 The fisherman lies concealed in his accustomed spot
 Brahma lives in his old residence.
 The customs of ancient times are handed down
 This picture brings to me a feeling of refinement.

In this case, too, Dr. Ferguson gives the text (right to left, vertically):

披	千	舊	前	雲	山	畫	詩
圖	古	宅	溪	光	色	裏	中
儼	風	梵	漁	卷	無	見	傳
起	流	王	父	復	還	詩	畫
余	在	居	隱	舒	有	餘	意

It is difficult to imagine a more grotesque mistranslation, which

can only tend to confirm the belief of the Philistine that Chinese poetry is nothing more than a ridiculous jumble of words. Line 3 is exceptionally preposterous as regards sense, from failure to see the obvious antithesis of 無 and 有. This poem may not be a very elevated effort, but it has a meaning, which can easily be made apparent. The writer is dealing with the double achievement mentioned above:—

In the poem is transmitted the purport of the picture;
In the picture we see the poem and to spare.
The colours of the mountains vanish and reappear;
The glory of the clouds is now rolled up, now unrolled.
In the foreground of the stream a fisherman is concealed;
There in the old shrine is the image of Brahma (= Buddha).
The atmosphere of antiquity is before us;
Unrolling this picture, I am deeply stirred.

Dr. Ferguson should either give up translating Chinese poetry, or take a few lessons in the book-language.

AN EMPEROR ON KU K'AI-CHIH

[The following paper is to a certain extent a joint production. My son, Dr. Lionel Giles, transcribed the original text into ordinary style. I assisted in its elucidation, and supplied the biography under note 8; the rest is his work. H.A.G.]

晉顧愷之善丹青。自言傳神正
在阿堵間。是知
非深入三昧者。
不能到此卷女
史箴圖。流傳千
數百餘年。而神
采煥發。意態欲
生。非後人窺測
所可涯涘。董香
光跋李伯時瀟
湘圖云。顧中舍
所藏名卷有四。
以此爲第一信哉。
是圖向貯御書
房。繼得李畫蜀

江九歌。瀟湘諸
卷。適符董跋中
名卷之數。爲移
置連福宮之靜
怡軒。顧曰。四美
以志秘賞千古
法寶。不致而會
正浚不可思議。
率紀數言。亦爲
是卷慶劍合也。
乾隆丙寅夏至
前五日。靜怡軒
御筆。

It has always been a fashionable practice in China for the owner of a celebrated picture who knew, or thought he knew, something about art, to append a note (跋) to the scroll expressing his appreciation of its beauty. The roll-painting, attributed to Ku K'ai-chih, in the British Museum includes a note of this description written by no less a personage than the Emperor 高宗純 Kao Tsung Shun, better known by his year-title as Ch'ien Lung (A.D. 1736—1796). Mr. Laurence Binyon, Keeper of the Department

晉顧愷之善丹青
自云傳神正
在阿堵間是知
非深入三昧者
不能到此卷如
史箴圖法傳子
如百餘年而神
采煥發意態如
生非後人窺測
所可涯涘董氏
光跋李伯時瀟
湘圖云顧中舍
所藏名卷有四
以此為第一信哉
是圖向貯御書
房總得李燕司

以此為第一信哉
是圖向貯御書
房總得李燕司
江九歌瀟湘諸
卷意符董跋中
名卷之如為移
置建福宮之靜
怡軒顏曰四美之
以志秘賞千古
法寶不形而會
正復不可思議
率紀如公亦為
是卷慶創合也
乾隆丙寅夏五
前五日靜怡軒
御筆

of Oriental Art, wishing to have as much light as possible thrown on the early history of this scroll, the genuineness of which is still disputed in certain quarters, has asked me to translate the inscription, here reproduced. The result is highly gratifying, in that it carries back the authentic record of this masterpiece to the 8th century—several hundred years earlier than the date of any of the seals hitherto deciphered.

Translation

Ku K'ai-chih of the Chin dynasty excelled as a painter. He used to declare that the power of imparting expression to a portrait depended on the treatment of the eyes;¹ and he knew that, without entering deeply into *samādhi*,² this power could not be attained. The present scroll, illustrating the Admonitions of the Imperial Preceptress, has come down to us from a period of over thirteen centuries³ ago, yet it manifestly bears the stamp of genius,⁴ and its whole expression is instinct with life. Later artists, in spite of all their efforts, have not been able to achieve like results. Tung Hsiangkuang⁵ says in his note on Li Po-shih's⁶ picture of the Rivers Hsiao and Hsiang,⁷ "Mr. Secretary Ku⁸ was the owner of four famous scrolls, of which he placed this one⁹ first. How true is this criticism!"¹⁰ This picture has always¹¹ been kept in the Imperial Library, which subsequently acquired the following pictures by Li Lung-mien: "The Yangtze in Ssü-ch'uan," "The Nine Songs,"¹² and "The Rivers Hsiao and Hsiang." Thus, the number tallies exactly with that of the famous scrolls mentioned in Tung's note, which were transferred to the Ching-i Pavilion of the Lien-fu Palace, and which Ku [Shao-lien] speaks of as the "Four Beauties."¹³ And now that I am minded to enjoy quietly these treasures of remote antiquity, brought together by no effort of mine, I feel deeply impressed beyond the range of thought, and proceed to

jot down these few words to accompany this beautiful scroll.¹⁴ Written by the Emperor in the Ching-i Pavilion, five days before the summer solstice of the year *ping-yin* in the reign of Ch'ien Lung.¹⁵

Notes

(1) Quoted from Ku K'ai-chih's biography in the 晉書, ch. 92. The whole passage runs: 愷之每畫人成、或數年不點目精、人問其故、答曰、四體妍蚩本無闕少於妙處、傳神寫照正在阿堵中。 This is translated by Professor Chavannes: "Quand (Kou) K'ai-tche faisait le portrait d'une personne, après l'avoir achevé il restait parfois plusieurs années sans y marquer les prunelles. Quelqu'un lui en ayant demandé la raison, il répondit: La partie grossière du corps, il n'y manque rien; mais c'est dans cet endroit délicat qu'on transporte l'âme et qu'on inscrit la ressemblance; pour le bien faire, c'est une question de prix." There are three mistakes in this short paragraph. In the first place 四體妍蚩 cannot mean "la partie grossière du corps." Secondly, a new clause cannot begin with 於妙處. Chinese idiom would not permit of such a construction; and, indeed, we find the *P'ei Wên Yün Fu* (ch. 37 B, f. 138 v⁰, under 阿堵) starting its quotation of Ku K'ai-chih's speech with the words 傳神. Yet it seems impossible to make sense out of the text as it stands, and I feel sure that it is corrupt. This view is confirmed by two other passages in the *P'ei Wên Yün Fu* (ch. 11 B, f. 80 v⁰, 傳神, and ch. 65, f. 14 v⁰, 妙處) where the same sentence appears thus: 四體妍蚩本無闕于(於)妙處, etc. It is easy to see how 闕 might have been carelessly transcribed 闕, and 少 afterwards interpolated as a gloss on the latter character. Adopting this as the correct reading, therefore, I would submit the

following translation of the whole anecdote: "When Ku K'ai-chih had finished a portrait, he would sometimes wait several years before putting pupils to the eyes. To some one who asked the reason of this he replied: The beauty or ugliness of the body as a whole is not bound up with that of any particular spots of exceptional delicacy; but the power of imparting expression and achieving a likeness does depend on the artist's treatment of such spots (*viz.*, the eyes)." 阿堵 is said by K'ang Hsi to be a 方語 vernacular phrase meaning "this;" and in the present passage it is evidently a pronoun referring to the eyes. It only came to mean "money" through the well-known story of 王衍 Wang Yen. (See Giles' Dictionary, No. 12045. The words given in the Chin History are 舉阿堵物 "Pick up this stuff.") It is not at all likely, however, that this use of the phrase became current until the publication of the dynastic history many centuries after Ku K'ai-chih's death.

Su Tung-p'o's essay 論傳神 "On portrait-painting," reprinted in the *T'u Shu*, XVII, 766, 總論 f. 28 v⁰, begins thus: 傳神之難在於目。顧虎頭云傳神寫照都在阿堵 "In imparting expression the difficulty is with the eyes. Ku K'ai-chih said, In imparting expression and achieving a likeness, all depends on these." [This essay is translated in "Introduction to the History of Chinese Pictorial Art, p. 105.]

(2) "The highest pitch of abstract ecstatic meditation" (Eitel).

(3) Literally, "a thousand and several hundred and odd years."

(4) 神采 might conceivably refer to the *colouring* of the picture as still retaining its freshness. But on consulting the *P'ei Wên Yün Fu*, I cannot find a single example of such a meaning. In each of the five passages there quoted, the phrase seems to correspond to something like our word "genius." *E. g.*, 晉書, Life of 周顗 Chou I: 少有重名、神采秀徹 "As a youth he gained great reputation as the possessor of mental gifts of a high order." For 煥發, cf. *Liao Chai Chih I*, ch. 2, 蓮香: 精神

煥發 "his vitality blazed forth," or in English idiom, "came back to him in a flood."

(5) *Hao* of the famous painter and calligraphist 董其昌 Tung Ch'î-ch'ang (A.D., 1555—1636).

(6) This is the "style" of 李公麟 Li Kung-lin, better known as 龍眠 Lung-mien.

(7) The Hsiang River, of which the Hsiao is an affluent, traverses the province of Hunan and flows into the Tung-t'ing Lake.

(8) Very probably a direct descendant of the painter, which would account for his being in possession of this picture. The following account of him is given in the *T'u Shu Chî Ch'êng*, XIV, 462; it is an abbreviated version of the "Life" in 新唐書, ch. 87, but nothing material has been omitted: 顧少連、字夷仲、蘇州吳人、舉進士、以拔萃、補登封主簿、于頔薦爲監察御史、德宗幸奉天、徒步詣謁、授水部員外郎、翰林學士、再遷中書舍人、閱十年、以謹密稱、改京兆尹、政尙寬簡、不爲灼灼名、卒諡曰敬。 "Ku Shao-lien, styled I-chung, was a native of Wu in Su-chou [the city of Soochow]. After taking his doctor's degree, he distinguished himself among his fellows and was appointed Deputy Assistant Magistrate at Têng-fêng [in Honan-fu], where Yü Ch'î recommended him for the post of Supervising Censor. The Emperor Tê Tsung, during his sojourn in Fêng-t'ien [now 乾州 Ch'ien-chou in Shensi; the Emperor fled thither in 783 A.D., when the rebel 朱泚 Chu Tz'ü marched upon Ch'ang-an], went on foot to visit him, and bestowed on him the posts of Second Secretary to the Board of Waterways and Reader in the Hanlin Academy. Thence he was transferred to become Secretary in the Council of State. After the lapse of ten years, having gained a reputation for carefulness and secrecy, he was made Governor of the Capital. His administration was lenient and easy-going, and

he made no very brilliant name for himself. After his death he was canonized as Ching." The words 中書舍人 place it beyond reasonable doubt that this Ku Shao-lien is the 顧中舍 mentioned in our text.

(9) 此 must of course refer to the painting now in the British Museum, but it seems rather curious that Tung should allude to it thus in a note on the picture of another artist.

(10) 信哉 might possibly be the Emperor's own comment.

(11) The word 向 "hitherto" must be used loosely, for it appears from certain seals on the picture (notably those of the famous collector 項子京) that it was in private hands during the Ming dynasty. My colleague, Mr. A. D. Waley, also calls my attention to two passages in which either our picture or a copy of it is mentioned. (1) The Ming writer 張丑 Chang Ch'ou says in his 清河書畫舫: 傳聞嚴氏藏顧愷之清夜遊西園圖、奇古無俗韻、又晉人畫張茂先女史箴圖 (then follows a list of several other pictures) --- 皆真蹟妙絕、未之目也、今大半歸韓太史家。"I have heard it said that Mr. Yen possessed the picture by Ku K'ai-chih entitled "A Ramble in the Western Garden on a Fine Night," an ancient masterpiece of exceptional refinement; also, "Chang Mao-hsien's [i. e. Chang 華 Hua's] Admonitions of the Imperial Preceptress" by a Chin artist, [etc.] . . . All these are genuine works of surpassing excellence. I have never seen them. More than half of them have now been added to the collection of Mr. Han, Compiler in the Hanlin Academy." [*T'u Shu*, XVII, 763, 彙考 15, f. 24]. (2) The above is confirmed by the item 晉人畫女史箴圖 among the 手卷 "makimonos" in a list of paintings which appear to have belonged to Mr. Yen (明嚴氏書畫記). [*T'u Shu*, XVII, 765, 彙考 17, f. 18 v⁰.] It is noteworthy that this picture is attributed only to "a Chin painter," whereas in the case of

certain other works Ku K'ai-chih himself is named as the artist. So far as we can trace its history, then, the British Museum painting seems to have remained in the possession of the Ku family until the death of Ku Shao-lien, which took place in the capital (Ch'ang-an). Then, or at some later date, it may have found its way into the Palace. The seal of the Emperor 徽宗 Hui Tsung shows that at the beginning of the 12th century, at any rate, it formed part of the Imperial collection. Under the Ming dynasty, it reappears in the possession of Mr. Yen and others, and only in the 17th century was it once more acquired for the Imperial Palace.

(12) The name of a poem by 屈原 Ch'ü Yüan (B.C. 332—295).

(13) It must not be supposed that this was anything more than a coincidence, though Ch'ien Lung seems to hint the contrary. Li Lung-mien lived long after the time of Ku Shao-lien, whose "four beauties" were probably all pictures painted by his ancestor.

(14) Some allusion is hidden in the words 慶劍 "felicitous sword," which I am unable to trace.

(15) 17th June, 1746.

HIBBERT LECTURES

In the course of the Hibbert Lectures for 1914, now going through the press, several points arose which it was impossible for me to deal with fairly by production of the Chinese text. As that is again impossible, so far as the printed volume is concerned, I propose to avail myself of this opportunity to furnish the necessary justification for the views expressed.

1.—At the beginning of an ode recording God's appointment of king Wên, Dr. Legge (*Odes*, p. 432) has,

The illustration of illustrious [virtue] is required below,

The dread majesty is on high.

Heaven is not easily to be relied on;

It is not easy to be a king.

Small wonder that we read in a note, "Lines 1,2 are certainly enigmatical." The third line, however,—Dr. Legge could with difficulty bring himself to say "God" instead of the impersonal "Heaven"—is more wrong than enigmatical. Herewith the text (left to right) and my rendering:

明	明	在	下
赫	赫	在	上
天	難	忱	斯
不	易	維	王

A man must show himself brightly virtuous on earth,
Then comes the exercise of majestic power from above.
God has difficulty in trusting any one,
For it is not easy to be a king.

2.—In the ode on the miraculous virgin birth of 后稷 Hou Chi, occur these lines (left to right):

無 蓄 無 害
以 赫 厥 靈

Dr. Legge, without whose splendid work Chinese scholarship would still be far below its present level, was after all a missionary; and just complaints have often been made of his biased treatment of not a few passages of the Confucian Canon. In my opinion, this bias was not wilful, but unavoidable; he himself was unconscious of it. Such a charge could be made in regard to the second line of the above (*Odes*, p. 467):

No injury, no hurt—

Showing how wonderful he could be.

This second is a positive anti-climax by its flatness. I ventured to substitute:

In order to emphasize his divinity.

3.—I have practically re-translated the whole of the ode to Hou Chi (Legge, p. 580). One line may be taken as a specimen:

莫 匪 爾 極

For this Dr. Legge has, "The immense gift of thy goodness." It seems to me to mean, "There is none greater than Thou!"—a sense fully borne out by the context and by other considerations mentioned in the Lectures.

4.—For 六十而耳順 in the Analects, Dr. Legge has, "At sixty, my ear was an obedient organ (for the reception of truth)." To me, the sense seems simply to be, "At sixty, I could trust my ears."

5.—In Lecture vi, I had occasion to allude to Manichaeism, and translated a few passages from the Chinese treatise discovered by

Professor Pelliot, and rendered into French by Professors Chavannes and Pelliot (*Journal Asiatique*, Nov.—Déc., 1911). On p. 119 there is the following passage: 喻若金師模白象形寫指環內 which is translated into French by, "C'est ainsi que, quand un orfèvre, copiant la forme d'un éléphant blanc, la grave à l'intérieur d'une bague." This is accompanied by a note: "模 *mo* est ici employé pour 摹; ce sens est omis à tort dans le dictionnaire de Giles." I admit that K'ang Hsi says 模與摹同; but the usage seems to be rare, and it is difficult to put everything into a dictionary. Meanwhile, I doubt if my sin of omission is anything like as grievous as the sin of commission in the above translation. The "white" elephant is a myth; its whiteness could scarcely be brought out by an engraver. 白 goes with 模, as the rhythm shows, and the phrase means "to copy in outline."

6.—In Lecture VII, I deal with the Nestorian Tablet, of which I may say at once that no accurate translation is yet in existence; I therefore took the liberty of translating what I wanted to quote. Referring to the various achievements of Christ, we find among others, 啓三常之門, translated by Dr. Legge (*Christianity in China*, p. 7), "He threw open the gate of the three constant (virtues)," with a note, "Probably, the three graces of Faith, Hope, and Love;" by Père Havret (*La Stèle Nestorienne*, p. 44), "Aperuit trium principiorum januas;" and by the Rev. A. C. Moule (*Journal N.-C. B. R. A. S.*, 1910, p. 88), who claims to base his version on Père Havret's, "He revealed the gates of the three which abide," without any further guidance as to who or what those three may be, but evidently referring to, "And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three (1 Cor. XIII, 13)." The term occurs in the 國語 *Kuo Yü*, and also in the history of the Northern Chou dynasty, where it means three constant practices: "(1) the appointment of wise men by the sovereign, (2) the reliance on wise men

by the officials, and (3) the respect for wise men by the people." It is impossible to regard it as a recognized translation of the Biblical "three," as the Bible had not then been translated.

A few words further on, we read 懸景日以破暗府, translated by Dr. Legge, "He hung up the bright sun to break open the abodes of darkness;" by Père Havret, "Affixit praeclarum solem, ad dirumpendam tenebrarum aulam;" and by Mr. Moule, "He hung up a bright sun to take by storm the halls of darkness." There is no record that Christ ever hung up either "the" or "a" bright sun, and we have to fall back on the root idea of 懸, which is one of hanging, without reference to mood or tense until the context has been stated. This is one secret of translating correctly, *i. e.* logically, from the Chinese. In the present case, we at once reach an intelligible meaning: "He was hung up (*q. d.* crucified), like a luminous sun, in order to prevail against the gates of hell." 暗府 is a Buddhist synonym for 冥府, 幽界, and similar expressions commonly used for "the next world," but here for the Christian hell (Acts II, 27).

Mr. Moule further thinks that the discovery of the Nestorian Tablet—"an event little short of miraculous"—"silenced completely and for ever" the taunt that "God had left the Middle Kingdom for more than fifteen hundred years without a word of the only Name under heaven whereby man must be saved." This recalls the argument of Philip Gosse, who when faced by geological discoveries which effectually disposed of Biblical chronology and the creation of the world in B.C. 4004, boldly declared that God Himself had placed those fossils in the earth, in order to try our faith.

COMMISSIONER LIN

Some time ago I received from a Chinese correspondent a thin volume containing the poems of one of China's great patriots of modern days,—Lin Tsê-hsü, known to foreigners as above. This collection was reverently compiled by Mr. 陳潛 Ch'ên Ch'ien, and exhibits the softer side of the character of the fearless Viceroy; we read of moonlight and wine in the melodious verses of a minor poet. The fame of Commissioner Lin needs not to be bolstered up by literary achievements, however great. His bold attempt at Canton to bring the opium question to an immediate end by the destruction of 20,291 chests of the drug, valued at some ten millions of dollars, can never be effaced from the annals of China. For this, when British arms triumphed over the Bogue Forts, he was made the scape-goat; first degraded and then sent in banishment to Ili, where he remained for two years. By and by he was restored to high office, being finally appointed acting Governor of Kuangsi and Imperial Commissioner with supreme command over the troops operating against the T'ai-p'ing rebels; but he died on his way to take up that post.

He is said to have addressed two letters to Queen Victoria, instructing her in peremptory language to take measures to put a stop to the opium trade. "Do not," he said, "by any means, by false embellishments, evade or procrastinate." Whether these letters ever reached the Queen is doubtful. They were circulated in Canton at the time, and translations of both will be found in the Chinese

Repository, vol. viii, pp. 9, 497. His presentment appears to have been exhibited among the wax-works of the day:

The king of the French and Fieschi the traitor
 Commissioner Lin and the Great Agitator,
 Kings, princes, and ministers, all of them go
 To sit for their portraits to Madame Tussaud.

Quite recently, I received from China a photograph of the family portrait of the famous Commissioner. For many centuries past it has been customary for distinguished officials and men of means to leave behind them pictures in which their descendants might see



them as they were "in the enjoyment of pleasures," perhaps engaged in their favourite pursuits. The Emperor Ming Ti, A.D. 58—76, caused the portraits of sixty officials of merit to be painted and hung in a gallery of the palace; and the stories we read of portraiture in early ages make us regret that none of them remain, if for no other reason, to be compared with the work of the modern painter. The remark by Ku K'ai-chih that the whole difficulty

lies in the eyes, has already (p. 48) been quoted; the cheekbones and jaws come second. Su Tung-p'o (11th cent.), who wrote the essay, complained that "nowadays the sitter is made to adjust his hat and clothes, and sit down and gaze at some object. The

result is that he puts on a face that is not his," and the likeness is of course a failure. This is precisely what happens with that terror, the modern photographer, who wants to produce an artistic, or what he thinks an artistic picture, to the exclusion of every other consideration.

The two portraits of Chu Hsi, (*d.* A.D. 1200) by 郭拱辰 Kuo Kung-ch'ên, "one large and the other small," have probably long since perished; but it is interesting to note how the great philo-



A thin nose



A fat nose

sopher dwelt upon what seems to be the essence of a good portrait-likeness. Chu Hsi says, "It was quite a joke to see how accurately he reproduced my coarse ugly face and my vulgar rustic turn of mind, so that even those who had only heard of, but had never seen me, knew at once for whom the portraits were intended." China must be flooded with such portraits as that of Commissioner Lin, painted in the Manchu days of decadent art. A well-known work, the 芥子園畫傳 *Chieh tzŭ yŭan hua chuan*, published in 1679, devotes one section to the art of portraiture, with illustrations. The student is taught that a portrait may be taken from any one of ten points of view between the profile and the full face. He is shown how to make a variety of noses, eyes, eyebrows, ears, etc., of which specimens are here given, instead of being taught to copy these from the human face. Hence, such work as may be

seen in the above portrait, which however has one merit. We see the fragile but lion-hearted old man arrayed, not in his official robes with nodding (when he nods) peacock-plumes and the glory of a red button; not with his embroidered official insignia and his

Refined eyes

畫
傳
四
秘
訣



Bold eyes

十
五

染 細 兼 威 其

horse-shoe sleeves, the latter adopted by the Manchus together with the pig-tail out of gratitude to their faithful ally, the horse;—but in a simple and appropriate undress which would leave him, except for himself, indistinguishable from any humble member of the literati.

By the

DATE DUE

A C				n, revised
an				ise)
Strat				n
Gem.				
Hist				
Chuc				uer
Chin				
Chin				
Reco				
Glos				n
Rem				
Syno				
Han				
From				
Dict				
A Cl				Académie
Fr				
Cata				
San				edition
Chin				
A H				

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

China and the Chinese, one lecture delivered at Columbia University, 1902

An Introduction to the History of Chinese Pictorial Art, with 16 Illustrations

Religions of Ancient China

China (Language, Literature, Religion), in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed.

Chinese Fairy Tales

The Civilization of China

China and the Manchus

Adversaria Sinica, Series I

Adversaria Sinica, Series II, No. 1

China, in the *History of the Nations* series

Confucianism and its Rivals, Hibbert Lectures, 1914

[Apply to Bernard Quaritch, 11 Grafton Street]

Printed by E. J. BRILL, LEYDEN (Holland).

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 648 562 7

